

Draft Individual Review Form
(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public.)

Proposal number: _2001-I202-1

Short Proposal Title: _Estuary Action Project

Explain connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write “none” if no connection): [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Vague detail: How connected to other local efforts. Aquatic Habitat Institute [unintelligible]

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Does not identify the nature of “curriculum” used by program providers – environmental education or environmental activism?

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Ongoing program previously funded by CAL FED and other sources.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not applicable.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not applicable.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

No letters of support from supporting organizations or schools involved in their outreach activities.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not applicable.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

Not applicable.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion

OK – not directly connected to the educational community.

Miscellaneous comments

Overview:

This proposal asks for funds to continue the outreach program that is ongoing in the East Bay Area region. It targets economically disadvantaged children of color by providing them with opportunities to become aware and take action on issues related to urban creek and San Francisco Bay area estuary pollution and environmental issues. The proposal requests funds to support the staff who manages the outreach efforts provided.

Positive aspects:

- This is an ongoing program that was sponsored by CAL-FED funding in 1999.
- The program reaches children in urban areas that otherwise would not likely be involved with watershed and ecological issues.

Negative aspects:

- The proposal does not identify the nature of the "curriculum" offered to the teachers and students. It is unclear if the program is environmental education or environmental activism. This is noted in the proposal where the children are made aware of an environmental issue related to watershed health and then respond with an "action" such as tree planting. It is unclear how baseline ecological principles and age level appropriate learning experiences are involved in the program.
- There are no letters of support or commitment of interest by schools that have been involved or will be involved in the program.
- It is not clear how this program is linked to a wealth of other environmental education training and outreach to teachers and students in the Bay Area.

Reviewer's Comments:

It would be important for CAL-FED staff to see how this program works on the ground before providing continued funding. Since there is no identified "curriculum" or clear idea of what the outreach involves, it would seem critical to find out what concepts are taught and materials

distributed. The targeted audience, traditionally underserved by most environmental education programs offered to teachers and students, is important to reach, but with high quality materials that are truly environmental education not propaganda.

**Overall Evaluation
Summary Rating**

- ☐ Excellent
- ☐ Very Good
- ☐ Good
- ☒ Fair
- ☐ Poor

Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating

[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]